

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/619,897	TAKAGI ET AL.
	Examiner James M Hewitt	Art Unit 3679

**All Participants:**

(1) James M Hewitt

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Joe Jochman

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 28 October 2005

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:**  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*double patenting rejection based on U.S. Patent No. 6,866,302*

**Claims discussed:**

N/A

**Prior art documents discussed:**

N/A


**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

On 3/17/05, Applicant's representative agreed to the abstract being rewritten as reflected in the accompanying Examiner's Amendment since the abstract submitted in Applicant's 2/16/05 amendment did not comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.72, and also agreed to a minor spelling change in the specification and to delete extraneous numeral "15" in line 12 of claim 1.

On 10/28/05, the examiner informed Applicant's representative that a terminal disclaimer would have to be filed to obviate an obviousness-type double patenting rejection based on U.S. Patent No. 6,866,302.